California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Central Valley Region
Robert Schneider, Chair

Alan C. Lloyd, Ph.D.
Agency Secretary

Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

Sacramento Main Office
11020 Sun Center Drive #200, Rancho Cordova, California 95670-6114
Phone (916) 464-3291 • FAX (916) 464-4645
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley

7 February 2006

Feb 07, 2006 00140

Mr. Paul Marshall
SDIP EIS/EIR Comments
State of California Department of Water Resources, Bay Delta Office
1416 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIS/EIR) FOR THE SOUTH DELTA IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (SDIP)

Thank you for the opportunity to submit the following comments on the subject document. Comments are provided regarding the potential impacts of the SDIP on dissolved oxygen (DO) and mercury impairments in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Delta), and issues related to the Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 401 Water Quality Certification that will eventually be required for this project from the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board).

DISSOLVED OXYGEN BACKGROUND

Several water bodies within the boundaries of the Delta have been included on the State Water Board's CWA Section 303(d) list as impaired due to low DO conditions. Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water Board) staff believes the physical and operational components of the proposed SDIP, along with existing State Water Project (SWP) and Central Valley Project (CVP) operations, have the potential to impact three of these impaired water bodies: Old River, Middle River, and the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel (DWSC) portion of the San Joaquin River between Stockton and Disappointment Slough.

In January 2005, the Central Valley Water Board adopted *Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins for the Control Program for Factors Contributing to the Dissolved Oxygen Impairment in the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel* (DO Control Program). In November 2005, the State Water Board approved the DO Control Program with minor modifications. The DO Control Program identifies reduced San Joaquin River flow through the DWSC as a major contributor to the DO impairment. It also recommends to agencies responsible for existing and future water resources facilities, which impact or have the potential to impact flow through the DWSC, that they evaluate and reduce their impacts on the DO impairment in the DWSC. The DO Control Program identifies the SDIP as a water resources project with the potential to impact flow through the DWSC. Also, the State Water Board in Water Right Decision D-1641 encouraged the parties involved in constructing and operating the barriers to consider the effects of the barriers on DO in the DWSC. In accordance with Central Valley Water Board and State Water Board regulatory guidance, and the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National

Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), an evaluation and mitigation of the impacts of the SDIP on DO conditions in the DWSC are required.

In 2002 the State Water Board adopted a revised 303(d) list of impaired water bodies. This list included DO impairments on Old River and Middle River within the Delta. Although the Central Valley Water Board has not yet developed control programs for these impairments, the EIS/EIR must evaluate and mitigate the potential impacts of the physical and operational components of the SDIP on these water bodies.

Central Valley Water Board staff has had numerous written and verbal interactions with Department of Water Resources (DWR) and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation staff during the preparation of the DO Control Program and the SDIP EIS/EIR. For reference, enclosed is a letter sent to DWR in October 2003 regarding some concerns we had with the administrative draft of the SDIP EIS/EIR. Also beginning in December 2003, Central Valley Water Board staff participated in California Bay Delta Authority (CBDA) sponsored Integrated Water Operations Forum & Framework (IWOFF) discussions aimed at developing the details of the Delta Improvements Package (DIP), of which the SDIP is a part. Central Valley Water Board staff participated in these meetings to provide input on the potential impacts of the proposed activities on the DO impairments in the Delta. For reference, enclosed is a letter sent to CBDA in November 2003, at the initiation of the IWOFF discussions, outlining our concerns regarding the proposed DIP actions. Many of the same concerns expressed in both these letters appear again in the comments below.

DISSOLVED OXYGEN COMMENTS

Comment #DO1 - References to Relevant Regulations Omitted
The following omissions in the SDIP EIS/EIR should be addressed:

a) There is no mention in Chapter 5.3, *Delta Water Quality Issues*, Page 5.3-6 of the DO impairments in Old and Middle Rivers, and DWSC, nor the ongoing and potential impacts of the existing Delta exports and the proposed operational alternatives on these impairments.
b) There is no mention of the DO impairments in Old and Middle Rivers in Chapter 5.3, *Delta Water Quality Variables*, Page 5.3-14 to 15.
c) In Chapter 5.3, *Assessment Methods*, at the end of the third bullet toward the bottom of the page 5.3-15, it should be clarified that the DO Control Program has been formally adopted by both the Central Valley Water Board and the State Water Board.
d) References to applicable sections of both the DO Control Program and Water Right Decision 1641 should be included in Chapter 8 *Compliance with Applicable Laws, Policies, and Plans and Regulatory Framework.*

Comment #DO2 - Significance Criteria
In Chapter 5.3 (page 5.3-21) the EIR/EIS states, *"No change [of a water quality variable] is allowed if the baseline value exceeds the maximum objective."*

a) In the case of DO, it should be clarified that no change should be allowed if the baseline values are <u>below</u> the <u>minimum</u> objective.
b) By definition when a water body is listed as impaired on the State Water Board's CWA 303(d) list (as is the case for DO in the DWSC, Old and Middle Rivers) baseline values already violate the objective. By applying this proposed general significance criteria, no further decrease in the DO water quality variable in these portions of the Delta should be allowed.

Comment #DO3 – Applicable Criteria for Dissolved Oxygen
The following comments apply to the discussion of the DO criteria/objectives contained in Chapter 5.3 of the SDIP EIS/EIR (pgs. 5.3-23 to 24).

a) The Basin Plan DO objective applicable to the DWSC applies at all times and places. There is no allowance in the Basin Plan for a 10% cushion of monthly average violations as proposed in the EIR/EIS. Any reduction of the monthly estimated DO concentration below the objective, therefore, should be considered a violation of the applicable objectives and should be considered a significant impact.
b) Applying the general significance criteria on page 5.3-21 (and addressed in Comment #DO2 above), no change to the DO variable should be allowed by the proposed project when the baseline value already violates the objective.
c) The DO objective applicable at all times and places in Old and Middle Rivers is 5.0 mg/L. This objective needs to be established as a criterion in this section of the EIR/EIS, and analysis of the potential impacts of the proposed projects against this criteria need to be provided elsewhere in the EIR/EIS. No such criteria or analysis is currently provided in the EIR/EIS.

Comment #DO4 - Methods for Assessing Impacts on Dissolved Oxygen
As proposed in EIS/EIR Chapter 5.3 (pgs. 5.3-18), using flow vs. DO curves developed from existing data is a reasonable approach to evaluating the impact of activities that reduce DWSC flow on the DO impairment.

The flow vs. DO model proposed in the SDIP EIR/EIS, however, is seriously flawed. The conclusion that DO is 6.0 mg/L when flow is 1500 cubic feet per second (cfs) is not supported by even a visual inspection of the data, nor is the conclusion that DO is 3.0 mg/L when flow is 0 cfs. A statistically valid model of the observed flow vs. DO relationship that considers variability is required if this approach is to be used.

Also, the flow vs. DO data presented in this chapter is for 1983 to 2001. Data exists through 2004 and part of 2005, which includes periods of particularly low DO conditions in the DWSC. All the most recent data should be used.

Comment #DO5 – Incorrect Representation of Central Valley Water Board Report
The EIR/EIS states in Chapter 5.3, Alternative 2A, Stage 1, Impact WQ-13, Page 5.3-33 *"[o]nly flows of less than 1,500 cfs are assumed to have an effect on the DWSC DO concentrations"* and attributes this to the *Total Daily Maximum Load for Low Dissolved Oxygen in the San Joaquin River* (Central Valley Water Board, 2003). This is an incorrect citation and must be removed or modified. The cited document states *"[f]or net daily flow above 3,000 cfs, there were no violations of either the 5.0 or the 6.0 mg/L Basin Plan DO objectives. Below 3,000 cfs, the DO concentrations decrease with decreasing flow. At flows below 1,000 cfs, about half of the daily minimum DO concentrations were below 5.0 mg/L."* These same words were also used in the February 2005 final staff report for the DO Control Program. At no time has the Central Valley Water Board stated or endorsed 1,500 cfs as a flow rate that will address the DO impairment.

Comment #DO6 - Balancing Operational Considerations
Chapter 5.3 (pg. 5.3-27) of the EIR/EIS describes the *"three major gate operation choices to provide maximum benefits from the tidal gate operations"*. Item 2 on this page describes the need to weigh the benefits of operating the head of Old River fish control gate to increase flow past Stockton (improving DO conditions in the DWSC) against the potentially negative impact of such operation on entrainment of larval and juvenile fish into the CVP and SWP pumps and the shifting of San Joaquin River salinity toward the Contra Costa Water District and SWP Banks facilities.

The balancing of competing positive and negative impacts is understandable, but choosing to protect one beneficial use at the expense of another is unacceptable. Mitigation of impacts for all beneficial uses must be provided. To the extent that the flow split to the San Joaquin River at the head of Old River is reduced below what would occur naturally at that point, mitigation measures must be implemented, by one means or another, at the same time those impacts occur.

The DO Control Program suggests that alternate measures may be considered by the Central Valley Water Board as a means of mitigating the impact of activities that reduce flow in the DWSC. If the head of Old River fish control gates must be opened to prevent fish entrainment and undesirable salinity impacts in the Delta, alternate measures (e.g. aeration) may provide an acceptable mitigation for the associated flow reduction in the San Joaquin River past Stockton. Before such alternate measures would be acceptable to the Central Valley Water Board, however, the effectiveness of such measures would need to be demonstrated.

It is understood that DWR is initiating the construction and operation of a demonstration aeration project at Rough and Ready Island in the DWSC. This project should provide useful information on the efficacy and the extent to which aeration can be used to improve DO conditions in the DWSC.

Comment #DO7 - Cumulative Impacts
Title 14. California Code of Regulations, Chapter 3 (CEQA Guidelines) at Section 15355 defines the cumulative impact from several projects as:

> *"…the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time."*

The SDIP EIS/EIR only evaluates the incremental impacts of the SDIP over and above baseline conditions. These baseline conditions (i.e. Alternative 1 - No Action) assume:

> *"…[a]ll of the temporary rock barriers (head of Old River fish control barrier, and Middle River, Grant Line Canal, and Old River flow control barriers) would continue to be installed and removed annually.*

The purpose of these ongoing temporary barrier operations, among other things, is to mitigate the water quality and quantity impacts of the current SWP pumping capacity of 6,680 cfs. According to the cumulative impact requirements of CEQA, the cumulative impact of the proposed SDIP components and the existing 6,680 cfs pumping capacity (a closely related past project) must therefore be evaluated and mitigated. Furthermore, as the temporary barriers were intended to provide mitigation for the impacts of

the existing pumping capacity, the permanent barriers, which will replace them, also need to mitigate the existing 6,680 cfs pumping capacity.

As the evaluation of all water quality impacts in Chapter 5.3 are based on the baseline assumption of current pumping capacity of 6,680 cfs with temporary barrier operations, the resulting analysis is incomplete. The tidal hydraulics analysis in Appendix D would need to be reworked accordingly. The discussion of these cumulative impacts should also be included in Chapter 10, *Cumulative Impacts*.

Comment #DO8 - Appendix D, DSM2 Modeling Methods and Results
Aside from Comment #DO7 above, please consider the following improvements to the tidal hydraulic analysis in Appendix D:

a) It would be useful to extend the time period of the DSM2 simulations to include more recent years when we also have data from the ultrasonic velocity meter (UVM) in the San Joaquin River near Stockton. This UVM meter was installed by the U.S. Geological Survey in 1995 and would provide useful comparison to DSM2 output for the same period.
b) Once consideration of current pumping and barrier operations are included, the explanation and presentation of the DSM2 flow modeling results needs to be improved. (e.g. the modeling results presented qualitatively in Figures 5.3-21 and 41 were difficult to interpret). More quantitative analysis needs to be performed and presented to support the conclusions made.

Comment #DO9 – Old River and Middle River DO Impairments
The draft SDIP EIS/EIR currently does not evaluate the impacts from various SDIP components (e.g. altered channel geometries in Delta waterways, or long-term barrier/pumping operations) on the Old River and Middle River DO impairments. Until such evaluation is performed, and the required mitigation measures are developed, the EIS/EIR is incomplete.

METHYL MERCURY BACKGROUND

The Delta is on the State Water Board's CWA 303(d) list because of elevated concentrations of methyl mercury in fish. The Central Valley Water Board submitted a technical Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) report to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) in the summer of 2005 (http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/programs/tmdl/deltahg.html). A draft amendment to the *Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins* (Basin Plan) will be presented to the Central Valley Water Board for possible adoption in the summer of 2006. The technical TMDL report identifies the SDIP as having the potential to increase methyl mercury concentrations in Delta fish.

Methyl mercury is a developmental neurotoxicant. Most at risk are human and wildlife fetuses and young. The primary route of exposure is from consumption of mercury-contaminated fish. Statistically significant positive correlations have been observed in the Delta and elsewhere between average annual unfiltered methyl mercury concentrations in water and aquatic biota**.** The relationship suggests that aqueous methyl mercury is an important factor controlling methyl mercury bioaccumulation in the aquatic food chain.

Aqueous methyl mercury is produced by sulfate reducing bacteria in sediment. Sulfate is used by these bacteria as the terminal electron acceptor in the oxidation of organic matter. Sulfate additions have been

observed to both stimulate and inhibit methyl mercury production (see TMDL report for details). It is not known how sensitive methyl mercury production in the Delta is to changes in sulfate concentration.

Sediment sulfate concentrations are determined by the concentration in overlying water. Primary sources of sulfate to the Delta are the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and seawater intrusion. Sulfate concentrations in the Sacramento River are about 7 times lower than in the San Joaquin and about 450 times less than in seawater. Therefore, changes in both the mixture of Sacramento to San Joaquin River water and in the volume of carriage water will alter regional sulfate concentrations in Delta sediment. These changes may significantly influence methyl mercury production in sediment and subsequent bioaccumulation in fish.

Sulfate amendment studies should be undertaken with sediment collected throughout the year from the Delta to determine whether methyl mercury production is sensitive to changes in sulfate concentration. If the results suggest that methyl mercury production is a function of sulfate, then the net change in methyl mercury concentration in water and biota should be determined for each SDIP operational alternative and the results considered when selecting the preferred alternative.

METHYL MERCURY COMMENTS

Comment #Hg 1. References to relevant Regulations Omitted
There is no mention in Chapter 5.3, *Delta Water Quality Issues*, of the CWA 303(d) listing for mercury in the Delta, or the tributary San Joaquin River and Mud Slough.

Comment #Hg 2. Applicable Criteria for Mercury
Chapter 5.3 needs to mention that the draft methyl mercury amendment to the Basin Plan recommends a small and large fish methyl mercury tissue objective and an average annual unfiltered aqueous methyl mercury goal to meet the tissue objectives.

Comment #Hg 3. Methods for Assessing Methyl Mercury Impacts
Chapter 5.3 should include DSM2 modeling results to quantitatively determine how the SDIP alternatives change ambient sulfate concentrations at various locations in the Delta. The DSM2 sulfate results should be integrated with laboratory and field methyl mercury production results to predict the magnitude of change in water and fish tissue methyl mercury concentrations for each SDIP alternative.

Comment #Hg 4. Cumulative Impacts
As stated in Comment #DO7 above, the methyl mercury analysis in the SDIP EIS/EIR needs to consider the cumulative effects of both the SDIP and the existing SWP and CVP operations. Chapter 10 should also include an analysis of how changes in ambient Delta sulfate concentrations might affect methyl mercury production in water pumped onto Delta Islands and exported south to the San Joaquin Basin and Mud Slough. Finally, the cumulative impact on the Delta of methyl mercury from both the SDIP alternatives and from agricultural return flow from Delta Islands and the San Joaquin River basin should be evaluated.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Comment #G1 – Section 401 Water Quality Certification

GENERAL COMMENTS

Comment #G1 – Section 401 Water Quality Certification
Any project involving in-stream construction activity requires a CWA Section 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. As part of this process, according to CWA Section 401, the State Water Board must certify that the proposed project will meet applicable water quality standards. An application for a Section 401 Water Quality Certification for the SDIP needs to demonstrate that this project has no impact on water quality, whether short-term (e.g. impacts from construction activities) or long-term (e.g. effects of new dredged channel geometry or long-term barrier/pumping operations). A certified SDIP EIS/EIR would need to be part of that application. To support a Section 401 Water Quality Certification, the SDIP EIS/EIR would at least need to address the DO and mercury related comments above.

If there are any questions regarding these comments please contact Jerry Bruns by e-mail at jbruns@waterboards.ca.gov or by phone at 916-464-4831. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kenneth D. Landau
Acting Executive Officer

Enclosures (2)

cc: Jerry Bruns, Central Valley Water Board
Les Grober, Central Valley Water Board
Sue McConnell, Central Valley Water Board
Chris Foe, Central Valley Water Board
Gita Kapahi, State Water Board, Division of Water Rights

California Regional Water Quality Control Board

Central Valley Region

Robert Schneider, Chair

Winston H. Hickox
Secretary for Environmental Protection

Gray Davis
Governor

Sacramento Main Office
Internet Address: http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb5
3443 Routier Road, Suite A, Sacramento, California 95827-3003
Phone (916) 255-3000 • FAX (916) 255-3015

TO: Paul Marshall
Department of Water Resources
Bay-Delta Office

FROM: Mark Gowdy
San Joaquin River TMDL Unit

DATE: 31 October 2003

SIGNATURE:

SUBJECT: ADMINISTRATIVE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT / REPORT, SOUTH DELTA IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT (SDIP)

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the subject document. Although, Regional Board staff did not have time for a detailed review, following are general comments relating to potential impacts on the dissolved oxygen impairment in the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel (DWSC).

Water quality impact WQ-19 properly identifies reduced flow in the San Joaquin River past Stockton as having a potential impact on DWSC dissolved oxygen concentrations. Discussion of the assessment methods or significance criteria in Chapter 5.3 or elsewhere in the document was not found. For example, justification was not provided to support the assumption that only flows less than 1,500 cfs have an effect on DWSC dissolved oxygen concentrations. The analysis supporting the assessment of water quality impact WQ-19 should be provided, including detail on the nature of the potential impact during different months and flow conditions for the various alternatives.

Mitigation measure WQ-3 has the potential to provide some or all of the required mitigation for water quality impact WQ-19, however, a more detailed description of Old River tidal gate operations is required. It is the position of Regional Board staff that the SDIP facilities be operated, at all times, to either maintain flow rates in the San Joaquin River past the head of Old River that would exist without the full effect of the CVP and SWP pumping projects, or provide an alternate form of mitigation for that portion of the flow that cannot be maintained because of other project constraints.

A detailed review of the document was not possible in the time provided. Staff will continue to evaluate the material presented on the hydraulics governing the flow split at the Head of Old River and other topics. Additional comments will be provided on the public review draft.

Please feel free to contact me at (916) 255-6317 or by e-mail at gowdym@rb5s.swrcb.ca.gov to discuss our comments further.

California Regional Water Quality Control Board

Central Valley Region

Robert Schneider, Chair

Terry Tamminen
Secretary for Environmental Protection

Sacramento Main Office
Internet Address: http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb5
3443 Routier Road, Suite A, Sacramento, California 95827-3003
Phone (916) 255-3000 • FAX (916) 255-3015

Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

TO: Patrick Wright
Executive Director
California Bay-Delta Authority

FROM: Les Grober
San Joaquin River TMDL Unit

DATE: 17 November 2003

SIGNATURE:

SUBJECT: CONSIDERATIONS FOR PROPOSED ACTIONS IN THE SOUTH DELTA

California Bay-Delta Authority staff is preparing a draft resolution and staff report for consideration by the Authority at its 11 December 2003 meeting regarding a proposed set of actions in the South Delta that implement the CALFED Record of Decision. It is our understanding that the resolution will direct the staff of the Authority and various CALFED implementing agencies to develop a public process, including hearings and CEQA/NEPA strategy, for implementing this set of actions. The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board) has regulatory authority over a number of legal requirements that may apply to different components of the proposed set of actions. At the request of Bay-Delta Authority staff, Regional Board staff has prepared an overview of regulatory concerns that should be considered by the public planning process for the these actions.

Impact on Dissolved Oxygen Impairment in the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel (DWSC)
Proponents of the proposed set of actions in the South Delta have indicated the dissolved oxygen impairment in the DWSC will be addressed comprehensively as part of the CALFED process that implements the actions. Regional Board staff has determined that the dissolved oxygen impairment in the DWSC is caused by the combined effects of i) loads of oxygen demanding substances to the channel from upstream, ii) reduced flow through the channel caused by upstream reservoir operations and other diversions, and iii) the altered geometry of the channel itself. In order to achieve a balanced evaluation of alternatives, the CALFED process addressing this impairment will need to give consideration to the way each of these factors contribute to the problem and the potential ways they can be mitigated.

A TMDL implementation plan was developed by the Dissolved Oxygen TMDL Steering Committee and submitted to Regional Board staff in February 2003. With some further development, this implementation plan could provide an acceptable framework for a well-balanced evaluation of the causes and alternative solutions to this impairment. The studies outlined in this plan can provide entities responsible for the various contributing factors with the information needed to develop the required mitigation measures. Having the California Bay-Delta Authority manage the execution of this plan as part of the CALFED process would provide the leadership and coordination these efforts require.

Impacts on Old and Middle River Dissolved Oxygen Impairments

Old River (between the San Joaquin River and the Delta Mendota Canal) and Middle River (between the San Joaquin River and the Victoria Canal) have been included on the State Board's 303(d) list as impaired due to low dissolved oxygen conditions. Although the Regional Board has not commenced TMDLs to evaluate the causes and potential solutions to these impairments, it is very likely that flow conditions in the South Delta have an impact on how oxygen demand is exerted in these channels. The planning required for the set of actions in the South Delta need to include consideration of potential impacts on these impairments.

Impact on San Joaquin River Water Quality

Delta water delivered to the San Joaquin River via the Delta Mendota Canal is one of the largest sources of salt in the river. The effect that increases in salinity of Delta water has on the San Joaquin River salinity impairment must be considered. The San Joaquin River is currently listed as impaired for salt, boron, selenium, diazinon, chlorpyrifos, organochlorine pesticides, mercury, and unknown toxicity. The water quality impacts of sediment, pesticides, selenium, and other pollutants must also be considered with regard to the augmentation of San Joaquin River flow by recirculating flow from the State and Federal water projects via the Newman Wasteway. The planning process for this project will need to consider the water quality impact on Newman Wasteway and the San Joaquin River. Waste Discharge Requirements may also be required from the Regional Board.

Section 401 Water Quality Certifications and Waste Discharge Requirements

Under Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404, projects that propose to discharge fill or dredged material into a water of the U.S. must obtain a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE). If such a project has the possibility to affect water quality, the project must also apply for a Water Quality Certification under Section 401 of the CWA. In California, the State and Regional Boards are responsible for providing these CWA Section 401 certifications, which are enforceable orders under California law. In order to issue a CWA Section 401 certification, it must be found that the project will, in accordance with the Basin Plan, protect beneficial uses, comply with numeric water quality objectives, and not violate anti-degradation policy of State Board Resolution No. 68-16. Waste Discharge Requirements may also be required from the Regional Board for the disposal of dredging spoils.

The improvements addressed by the draft Bay-Delta Authority resolution include the proposed South Delta Improvement Projects (SDIP). The SDIP involves dredging and construction of other in-stream structures in the South Delta and will require a CWA Section 404 permit from the USACOE and a CWA Section 401 certification from Regional Board staff. In order to obtain this certification, the project will need to provide mitigation for any negative impact it may have on any water quality conditions in the Delta, including dissolved oxygen impairments in the DWSC and Old and Middle Rivers. It is the position of Regional Board staff that the SDIP must provide mitigation for the entire effect of State Water Project and Central Valley Project pumping on flows in the San Joaquin River.

Impacts on NPDES Permitted Facilities

The determination of effluent limitations for NPDES permitted wastewater facilities may consider the amount of flow available in the receiving waterbody for dilution of constituent concentrations present in the discharge. If flow in a receiving waterbody for a wastewater facility is decreased by the proposed set of actions in the South Delta, that facility could potentially be faced with more stringent NPDES effluent

limitations for which costly improvements or operational changes may be required. The planning process for improvements in the South Delta must include consideration of such potential impacts.

To the extent that these considerations can be addressed in the Bay-Delta Authority resolution and/or staff report it will provide assurance to the State and Regional Boards and various other agency and non-agency watershed stakeholders that they will be addressed in a thorough and well-balanced fashion under the leadership of the California Bay-Delta Authority. We appreciate the consideration given to our concerns by you and your staff and look forward to participating constructively in the upcoming planning process.

cc: Gita Kapahi - State Water Resources Control Board